

Greenville Bus Transfer Center
Greenville, North Carolina
MMPA Project No. 07124.00



**MOSE
MAYER
PHOENIX**
ASSOCIATES, PA

Team Visits Meeting Summaries – March 17, 2008

Meeting 1: Steering Committee Site Selection Workshop

Attendees:

Nancy Harrington	Transit Manager, GREAT
Thom Moton	Assistant City Manager, City of Greenville
Peg Gemperline	Parking and Transit Commission
Bob Thompson	Parking and Transit Commission
Mike Kozak	NC DOT
Jeff Crouchley	NC DOT
Todd Johnson	East Carolina University
Elvis Latiolais	Carolina Trailways
Phil Dickerson	Pitt County
Marlene Connor	Wilbur Smith Associates
Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

C O M P L E T E
F A C I L I T I E S
S O L U T I O N S

Architecture

Engineering

Interior Design

Site Services

Items Discussed:

1. **Introduce Roles:** Ken Mayer opened the meeting with a review of the day's agenda and an introduction of Marlene Connor, who is the Design Team member responsible for developing the operating model for the Bus Transfer Center. He also reviewed the objectives for each of the day's meetings.
2. **Review bus circulation models –** As preparation for the Site Selection Workshop, Laird Pylkas reviewed a Power Point presentation that discussed the pros and cons of various bus circulation and parking models. This information was intended to help the Steering Committee understand the merits of different sites as they related to bus movement approaches needed on each.
3. **Agree on Goals:** Laird then took the Steering Committee through the development of an overall goal statement to guide the site selection process. The Committee ultimately agreed to the following goal statement:

“To evaluate and provide a recommendation for a site for the new Bus Transfer Center consistent with economic, urban design and operational requirements. This will be accomplished in a collaborative manner with GREAT, the City of Greenville, PATS, ECU, Pitt County, Carolina/Greyhound Trailways, and the MMPA Design Team.”

3 2 8 E a s t
M a r k e t S t r e e t
S u i t e 2 0 0
G r e e n s b o r o
N o r t h C a r o l i n a
2 7 4 0 1

P 336.373.9800
F 336.373.0077

www.mmpa.com



4. Brainstorm/Agree-on Criteria: Laird then gave an overview of the potential criteria to utilize in evaluating each site. After some discussion, the following criteria were agreed to: Size, Economic Development, Access/Operations, Cost, 10th Street Connector Adjacency, Availability, Intermodality, Urban Design/Planning, Image, and Proximity to Downtown.
5. Criteria Weighing: For the next part of the discussion, each Steering Committee member was asked to rate their most important criteria. Their comments are summarized as follows:

Mike Kozak: Functionality/Size/Operations; Connectivity; Cost (do not limit your vision by cost initially); Image are most important.

Thom Moton: Connectivity; Size/Function are most important; Economic Development less critical; other criteria have equal weight

Peg Gemperline: Functionality/Operations; Cost; Size/Expandability are most important; other criteria have equal weight

Bob Thompson: Cost; Operations; Availability are most important; other criteria are secondary

Todd Johnson: Operations; Cost; Availability; Intermodality; Connectivity; Image are all of primary importance. Size is a close second. Regarding Economic Development, growth of the system itself is Economic Development, other ED aspects less critical. Done well, Urban Design and Image will solve each other.

Jeff: Operations/Functionality most important. Image is critical—look at the positive impact created by Spartanburg's new facility.

Elvis Latiolais: Cost; Access; Intermodality are most important. His point of view is from the private sector where efficiency and reduced operating costs are essential and market share will increase through intermodality.

Phil Dickerson: Size/Expansion; Operations; Intermodality are primary. Connectivity; Cost; Image are secondary.

Nancy: Operations is first; Size/Expansion is second; 10th Street Connector Proximity, Availability, Connectivity, Intermodality are all third.

From this discussion, a consensus was reached on the weighting of each criteria.

6. Review of proposed sites and known constraints: Laird and Ken then briefly reviewed each site and their pros and cons.
7. Review blocking plans: Laird and Ken then briefly reviewed the blocking plans and their relationship with the site concepts.

The meeting then adjourned until later in the afternoon.

Summary prepared by: Kenneth C. Mayer, Jr., AIA, LEED AP
Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

Meeting Two: Meeting with Transportation Providers and the City to discuss the Operating Model

Attendees:

Thomas Moton	Assistant City Manager, City of Greenville
Elvis Latoilais	Carolina Trailways
Michael Kozak	NC DOT
Nancy Harrington	Transit Manager, GREAT
Jeff Crouchley	NCDOT
Bob Thompson	Parking and Transit Commission
Rebecca Clayton	PATS
Wood Davidson	ECU
Marlene Connor	Wilbur Smith Associates

Meeting agenda:

- Team Introductions
- WSA Role of Operations Model
- Data Collection
- Missing Data
- Next Steps

Discussion Summary:

The operating model is being developed to provide the basis for the operating agreement for the proposed partners in the Intermodal Center. It builds from the facility programming plan to define which party will pay for which use of the facility once it is ready to be opened.

The primary tenants of the building will be GREAT, the City of Greenville Transit Service, PATS, Carolina Trailways/Greyhound, and ECU, with some potential outside and incidental use by taxi's and for the hospital shuttle.

There was general discussion from each of the representative parties on their general use, hours per day, days per year, expected personnel to be stationed in the facility and expected use, both internal and external.

There was an initial conversation between the City and Carolina Trailways/Greyhound regarding the potential for the City to become the ticketing agent for Carolina Trailways/Greyhound.

PATS foresees limited interior use of the facility, but also foresees the potential of the Intermodal Facility for other regional/county Community Transportation providers who might use the facility as a transfer point for various services to gain access to Carolina Trailways or to the ECU campus.

ECU has some remaining questions regarding which of their services could best take advantage of the intermodal facility including their late night service, their west side day service or other services. Currently Mendenhall/Westend is a major job for ECU service, but depending on costs and facility location, the intermodal facility could become at least a minor hub for some ECU service.

The following items were agreed to by everyone at the meeting:

1. Thomas Moton agreed to identify typical commercial operating and maintenance costs for facilities in the downtown Greenville area.
2. Nancy Harrington agreed to look to get information on nearby intermodal facilities operating budgets from Rocky Mount and Wilson which both have intermodal facilities.
3. Marlene Connor is going to distribute a meeting summary, which everyone would review to make sure all points were covered.
4. Wood Davidson provided additional ridership and operating information for ECU services, more can be provided if necessary.

An operating plan will be developed based on two different levels of ECU service to be at the Intermodal Facility.

Summary prepared by: Marlene Conner
 Wilbur Smith Associates

Meeting Three: Consultant Team Worksession to summarize results of Meeting One

Attendees:

Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

1. Ken and Laird met to review and evaluate each site in accordance with the criteria and their weights as developed by the Steering Committee. The data was entered into a table that automatically calculated final rankings.

Meeting Four: Steering Committee Site Selection

Attendees:

Nancy Harrington	Transit Manager, GREAT
Thom Moton	Assistant City Manager, City of Greenville
Peg Gemperline	Parking and Transit Commission
Bob Thompson	Parking and Transit Commission
Mike Kozak	NC DOT
Jeff Crouchley	NC DOT
Todd Johnson	East Carolina University
Elvis Latiolais	Carolina Trailways
Phil Dickerson	Pitt County
Marlene Connor	Wilbur Smith Associates
Laird Pylkas	Wendel Duchscherer
Ken Mayer	Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

1. Laird handed out the preliminary site scoring. After much discussion, and some modifications to specific site criteria ratings resulting from the discussions, the Steering Committee reached consensus on a preferred site.
2. The final matrix illustrating the criteria, criteria weights, site rankings, and final site selection is attached to this summary.
3. Next steps
 - a. Thom will review the Committee's recommendations with the City Manager followed by discussions with the City Council
 - b. The Design Team will refine the alternate site layout concepts for the selected site and send to Greenville for their review.
 - c. Marlene Connor will develop the draft of the Operating Model for review and comment.

Please notify the writer of any changes to this summary.

Summary prepared by: Kenneth C. Mayer, Jr., AIA, LEED AP
 Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

C: All Attendees